

1948

Mike Mansfield - Campaign Speech for Reelection

Mike Mansfield 1903-2001

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches

Recommended Citation

Mansfield, Mike 1903-2001, "Mike Mansfield - Campaign Speech for Reelection" (1948). *Mike Mansfield Speeches*. 27.
https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches/27

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by the Mike Mansfield Papers at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mike Mansfield Speeches by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

My fellow Montanans:

This is Mike Mansfield speaking. I want to, at this time, thank the people of Montana for the consideration you have always shown to me over the years. I am grateful for your many kindnesses to me during this and previous campaigns. I have tried to see as many of you as I could so that I could become more aware of your problems -- so that I could have the benefit of your advice and counsel -- and so that I could be a better representative of the people of this State. My entire record and my personal background have been placed before you over the past eight years, because everything I have done has been above board and for all to see. My record, while not perfect, is good, and I am proud of it. My opponent in this campaign has been indulging in personalities for the past six months, uttering outrageous falsehoods and raising a few legitimate issues. I shall not indulge in personalities, but I will expose his lies and I will declare my position not only on the issues which he has raised but also on a number of others and ask him to tell the people of Montana what he stands for.

So far as I have been able to see, the only thing he is in favor of is the Taft-Hartley Act, and he is against everything else. It is very easy to become personal in a campaign if a candidate desires to be elected regardless of the cost and at any price. It is very easy to criticize but very difficult to offer an alternative. Never once have I heard my opponent mention Montana, our people, or our resources. Evidently the job means everything to him -- our State, our people, and our future mean nothing. He has been a demagogue as attested to by an

article appearing in the Great Falls Tribune of September 14 in which he is quoted as saying in Butte on October 13 that "Russian and Chinese soldiers slaughtering Americans in the streets of Butte and other Montana cities is a definite possibility", and claiming further, "Such an occurrence could develop from the Mansfield report on China." This to me is a most despicable statement, and for a congressional campaign in this district it hits a new low. Would he think that he could fool and frighten the decent, hard-working citizens of this district by making such an outrageous and demagogic statement? If he would, I am afraid he has much to learn from the people he seeks to represent.

My opponent, according to the Missoulian of July 19, asked "Why Mansfield failed to defend American freedoms on the Mundt-Dixon Bill?" Surely he has gone over my record with a fine-toothed comb and knows that I voted for the Mundt-Dixon Bill two years ago and for the McKaren Anti-Subversive Bill in September of this year. On July 15, according to the Great Falls Tribune, he even accused me of "standing on my record." Of course I am standing on my record — a record of eight years in behalf of the people of the State of Montana and my country — a record which is down in black and white for everyone to see and for everyone to judge. It is a record that will stand the test of any scrutiny, and I commend it to my opponent for further study.

My opponent seems to be accusing the Mansfield report on China, submitted to the Congress and the President of the United States in January 1945, as being something which was responsible for the outbreak

of the Korean war. He has used his debating technique to try to put thoughts into the minds of the people of Montana and words into my mouth which he could not substantiate from the report. He states, according to the speech which he made before the Republican State Convention last summer and thousands of copies of which he has distributed throughout the State since, that I said that the communists in China were "agrarian reformers." He is entirely mistaken because what I said in the report was that the interests of the Chinese communists "seem to focus on agrarian reforms." It might interest the people of Montana to know, and I am sure it will come as a surprise to my opponent, that General Patrick Hurley, former ambassador to China and former Republican Secretary of War in the Hoover cabinet, stated in his speech before the Washington Press Club on November 29, 1945 -- long after my report on China was published -- "The only difference between Chinese communists and Oklahoma Republicans is that the Oklahoma Republicans are not armed." Furthermore, General Hurley also said, and I read from the record, "Before the Yalta Conference I suggested to President Roosevelt a plan to force the National Government, that is of China, to make more liberal political concessions in order to make possible a settlement with the communists. The President did not approve the suggestion."

He also tries to make you believe that the warning I received from Sun Yu in that report about "an idealistic bond between Yen-an and Russia" was not passed on to the President or Congress. The warning was passed

on, not merely to the President and to Congress, but to the American people generally and even to Mr. McGinnis himself. If you will read the first paragraph on the first page of his speech delivered to the Montana State Republican Convention in Helena on August 19, 1950, you will note that he states, "I first received a copy of the Mansfield report on China during the spring of 1945. At that time I became amazed that Mike Mansfield, in his report to Congress, actually endorsed and praised the Chinese communists, even though he did not visit their territory in China." Where else would he find out about the warning if not from that report? The warning, as part of the report, is in the Congressional Record for all to see. That report was sent to every newspaper in the State of Montana, but as far as I know, only one newspaper, the Great Falls Tribune, carried it in July. Furthermore, and I am sure people listening in will find this of interest, I received a letter from my opponent, dated December 5, 1945, from the Port Director's Office, Seattle, Washington, Thirteenth Naval District. The last paragraph reads as follows -- and this is from my opponent: "Well, Mike, keep up your excellent work. I know you have a good slant on things, and goodness knows there is the greatest need for vision in any action on American problems." You will note that in his speech he stated that he received a copy of the Mansfield report on China in the spring of 1945. This portion of the letter which I have just read was dated December 5, 1945. Why did it take my opponent so long -- five years -- to tell the people about these charges of his? Why didn't he write to me and call them to my attention and demand an explanation? Why is he using such low-down, gutter-snipe tactics?

Does he think that by using the Hitler and Stalin technique of the big lie that he can hood-wink the people of Montana?

He also states that because of the Mansfield report President Truman in 1945 informed our faithful ally, Nationalist China, that unless the communists were admitted to the government, the United States would supply no further aid. In answer I want to state that my opponent has greater access to White House information than I have. The President at no time has informed me that my report was the basis for any of his actions on China. The distortion in this assertion becomes even more evident when it is realized that aid of one sort or another has continued almost without interruption since V-J Day and is indeed going forward to Formosa today.

My opponent also states repeatedly that "five years ago Mansfield implied that we had nothing to fear from China." There is no such implication anywhere in the report. On the contrary, for those who have eyes to read it honestly, read it. There is a clearcut warning of the danger of civil war in China, and, if it came, the possibility of "intervention of a great power in the Chinese internal situation." That is precisely what has happened because, as every grade school child knows, Russia is the power behind Communist China today.

He states also that "anyone reading the Bolton report would know we have plenty to fear from communism anywhere in the world." In answer I want to say that the Bolton report was published in 1948, three years after my mission to China. That report was the work of a sub-committee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee of which I am a member. I approved

the issuance of the Bolton report, and I also voted for the publication of thousands of additional copies.

My opponent also states "at no time since World War II has he opposed the State Department policy of appeasing communist aggression." Well, the debate coach is at it again. When in doubt be indefinite. What appeasements? Where did they take place? Is aid to Greece and Turkey appeasement? Is voting for the Marshall Plan in Europe to stop communism appeasement? Is voting for the North Atlantic Pact and the Mutual Defense Assistance Act to arm our friends in western Europe appeasement? Is voting for a 70-group Air Force appeasement? Is fighting for a strong Marine Corps appeasement? Is voting for military aid to China, the Philippines, Iran, and Korea appeasement? Is voting for economic aid to Korea appeasement? By the way, my opponent has stated that "the blood of every American killed in our war against communism should cling to the conscience of my opponent, Mike Mansfield." This is so despicable a charge that it is contemptible. Why doesn't he tell you that the bill for aid to Korea was defeated by a vote of 192 to 191 in the House on January 19, 1950; and why doesn't he tell you that of the 192 who voted to kill the Korean aid bill, 130 were Republicans who lined up with Mark Antonio of New York to kill it? Why doesn't he tell you that I led the fight for the same and that I voted to have the second bill, which passed, brought up? The Republicans led the fight against aid to Korea and called it "Operation Rat-O." It was an easy bill to vote against, it was an easy bill to demagogue about, but it is a hard vote for the Republicans to explain today. When

Mr. Voorhees, Republican of Ohio, made the motion to kill the Korean aid bill, he said, on page 672 of the Congressional Record for January 19, 1950, "This is an easy bill to vote against. This is an easy bill to demagogue about. This is an easy bill to vote against because you can say you are doing it in the name of economy. But before you do so, you had better think of your responsibility as American citizens, and you had better think of the welfare and security of your own country. The charge is pretty definite -- the decision is up to us." On page 1782 of the Congressional Record of February 9, 1950, when the Korean-Formosan aid bill finally passed, I had this to say in leading the fight for the bill: "The issue is clear. We ought to be satisfied that the time is at hand when we can stand up and be counted. We have a pledge to keep, and I hope on this floor today we are sure that we mean what we say by giving an overwhelming vote in favor of this measure."

I have advocated and voted for every measure designed to check communist aggression and to provide us with allies. If my opponent only knew the fights we have had to get what little we got over strong Republican idealistic opposition, he would be aware of the fact, as I am sure he is, that the lies fly back in his teeth. Read the record and note how I stand on every measure. I am not a post-Korea preparedness man because I have recognized the situation throughout the world as it actually has existed. My opponent even states that my report on China helped to create the war in Korea today. This is a contemptible effort to capitalize, for political purposes, on the anxiety of all Americans over events in Korea and the risks to which our young men are being subjected there. Korea is not mentioned once in my report of 1945.

There is, on the other hand, ample warning of the danger to the peace in the Far East if China did not set its house in order and thereby forestall imperialistic intervention by the Soviet Union.

He states further, "Ever since 1945 I doubted and questioned his inference that we had nothing to fear from communism in China." Again the debate coach takes the stand. Remember his letter to me of August 1945 complimenting me on my position. My opponent infers and implies what exists in his mind, and fortunately I am not responsible for that. The stated facts disprove his contention and show him up for what he really is. It is a strange kind of logic that interprets the clear warning of a dangerous situation as meaning there is nothing to fear. I wonder what my opponent would have had me report. Would he want me to lie or to tell the truth? Why does he attack me for telling the truth? Would he bear false witness to catch a vote? If he would, he is not fit for any office, not even a teaching position, let alone representing you in the Congress of the United States.

You are entitled to know my full record as your representative, and you are entitled to know my background and my opponent's, too. He has not told you what he stands for, nor has he mentioned his background. I do not know what he is for, but it appears from his press releases that he is against everything. As far as our backgrounds are concerned, I do not need to tell you that I was raised in Great Falls, worked in the smelter there and in the mines in Butte, and that I served in the Navy during the first war at the age of 14 and later in the Army and Marine Corps as an enlisted man. You all know that and

also that I taught at our University for ten years before going to Congress. But what do you know of my opponent's background? Why doesn't he spell it out for you? He came from Ohio to Montana in 1939, and excluding his war service as an officer in the Navy he has been in our State eight years. What has he said in his campaign that indicates he is interested in us, our future, and the development of our State. Is he afraid to give credit where credit is due for Hungry Horse, Canyon Ferry, the Anaconda mines, the Libby Dam, the REA's, the new industries in the Butte-Anaconda and Hungry Horse areas, and all the other things we have all done together to build Montana? No, Montana and its people are not worth mentioning by this carpetbagger.

Peace by him is only worth mentioning to the extent that he says in his report that "the United Nations could not prevent a third World War." I do not subscribe to his defeatist attitude about world peace because I will never let up in my efforts to achieve it. Neither do I subscribe to his defeatist attitude about the United Nations because it is Man's best and perhaps last fight for peace. I will fight to keep it going, to strengthen it, to participate in it, because I believe that the lives of our people are the most important resource we have. Neither do I subscribe to his apathy. He has said nothing about maintaining our security. What does he stand for in preparedness? He hasn't said a word. Oh yes, he said I did not vote for preparedness measures before the Korean war, but he cannot prove it and the record will bear it out.

As far as I can find out he stands for:

1. River valley integration. But he says I do, too.
2. He stands for winning the war. Every American does.
3. To establish peace. And every American does, too.
4. He stands for defending our American freedoms forever.

What American doesn't.

But maybe his real platform is summed up in his fifth plan in which he says "Switch from Mike." That is something that neither he nor I can decide. That decision rests with the people of Montana, who will have to decide on November 7 whether I have performed my duties as their representative honestly, capably, and as they would want me to. I lay my eight years record -- and I am proud of it -- before the people to whom I am responsible; and I ask them, on the basis of my stewardship, not to switch from Mike, but to vote right, vote Mike.

My opponent says I have ridden the fence on the CVA and asks me what my stand is on Senate Bill 1645. It is all I can do to read as many of the 9500 House bills introduced in this Congress without having to go over to the Senate and reading their bills, too. Consequently, I have not read Senate Bill 1645. I do want the people of Montana to know, though, that I am not against a CVA or any other similar idea, because I think every measure should be considered on its merits, and I would welcome discussion on the House floor of the CVA bills introduced by Senator Cain, Republican of Washington, or Senator Magnuson, Democrat of Washington, if they ever get out of that body. I feel that any measure which would bring about greater economy of operation, do away with disruption of services, decrease the number of bureaus, and bring

about benefits for the people in the area concerned should be given very serious consideration. However, as I have stated repeatedly to the people of Montana, I would not be in favor of any kind of bill, regardless of what it would do, if it meant another attack on the level of Flathead Lake; if it meant that Montana would not get first and major use out of the waters of our State; and if it would not mean added benefits, more jobs, and greater security to our people.

My opponent preaches economy, says he will reduce taxes, and pulls leather on the bureaucrats. How does he propose to produce economies? How does he propose to reduce taxes? And why should he, of all people, find fault with bureaucrats? I wish my opponent would tell the people of Montana if in his residence in the State of Montana he has ever worked for private enterprise. I know that he has drawn his salary from either the State or the Federal Government during his entire residence in our State -- and in my book that makes him a bureaucrat. He'll probably come back and tell you that he has only actually lived in the State of Montana eight years and that for three years in addition he was an officer in the United States Navy.

I hope that he doesn't expect to win on his war record alone, because in that respect he and I both have war records. However, 100,000 other men in the State of Montana have just as good war records as his or mine, and most of them, I believe, are a great deal better. I deserve no credit for my war record. I am deeply grateful that I was privileged to serve my country. The men who really deserve credit for their war records are the men who never returned from war. I do not

believe that any candidate for political office should ever presume on his record in the service of his country. I feel very humble in comparison with the men in all branches of the service who died and were never able to return, or who were injured and never able to resume a normal occupation. In comparison with them my contribution has been very small indeed.

COPY